

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 5, 2003 (Paper No. 1). Claims 1 to 28 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 28 are being amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 22 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response, Claim 22 is amended and recites program stored on a computer-readable medium. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, Claims 1 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,574,002 (Paczewitz) and U.S. Patent No. 6,441,924 (Matsui).

Claim 1 defines an information processing apparatus for forming print data which can be interpreted by a printing apparatus in accordance with document data formed by an application. The information processing apparatus comprises a setting means, a name designation means and a forming means. The setting means is adapted to set either a mail box mode to accumulate the print data into the printing apparatus without printing it or to a printer output mode to sequentially print the print data received by the printing apparatus. The name designation means is adapted to designate a document name of the print data, and the forming means is adapted to form the print data by adding the information indicative of a designation in the printing apparatus in accordance with the output mode set by the setting means. As is recited in Claim 1, the document name designated by the name designating means can be voluntarily designated via a user

interface screen of the information processing apparatus and is to be displayed on an operation panel of the printing apparatus.

The applied art, namely Paczewitz and Matsui, is not seen to disclose or to suggest a name designating means for designating a document name of print data, whereby the document name can be voluntarily designated via a user interface screen of the information processing apparatus for display on an operation panel of the printing apparatus.

It is conceded in the Office Action, at page 3, that Paczewitz fails to disclose a mail box mode, which when set accumulates print data into a printing apparatus without printing. In addition, Applicant submits that the applied art fails to disclose a name designating means for designating a document name of the print data, wherein the document name can be voluntarily designated via a user interface screen of the information processing apparatus and is to be displayed on an operation panel of the printing apparatus.

Paczewitz is seen to disclose a method by which a user is able to specify the type of print media for use with a given print job. More particularly, the method of Paczewitz is understood to allow a user to set the print media type using a dialog box, which is displayed after the user initiates a print job. (See Paczewitz, Abstract) The background discussion in Paczewitz is understood to describe a set-up page that allows a user to set the print media type, which is accessible at the time the user initiates the print job, but not afterward. (See Paczewitz, col. 1, lines 7 to 35) While Paczewitz shows that a user can elect to print to a file, this is not seen to be the same as a mail box mode that when set accumulates print data into the printing apparatus without printing. In addition,

Paczewitz is not seen to disclose or to suggest voluntarily designating a document name, using a name designating means, via a user interface screen of an information processing apparatus that forms the print data, the designated name is to be displayed on an operation panel of the printing apparatus, which accumulates or prints the print data according to the setting means.

Matsui is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted with respect to Paczewitz.

More particularly, Matsui is seen to describe a system in which documents received by a facsimile apparatus are forwarded to a mailbox located on one of the computers connected to the facsimile apparatus via a network. (See Matsui, Abstract) At col. 5, lines 19 to 32, Matsui is seen to describe entering a mail box number, a password and a print instruction to print the contents of a mail box. However, this is not seen to be the same as designating, for print data, a document name, which can be voluntarily designated via a user interface screen of an information processing apparatus and is to be displayed on an operation panel of the printing apparatus.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 8 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 76811 v 1